

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

DON KING PRODUCTIONS, INC.

Plaintiff

v.

EL BODEGON, et al.

Defendants

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil No. 04-1861(SEC)

OPINION AND ORDER

On May 4, 2005 the Court referred the instant case to Magistrate Judge Aida Delgado-Colón for a all further proceedings (Dockets ## 50-51). Then, on August 29, 2005 Magistrate Delgado-Colón issued her Report, recommending that Plaintiff's motions for default judgment (Dockets ## 35 & 45) be granted and that default judgment be entered against Co-defendants Jarana's Café & Bar; Francisco Román-Medina, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Francisco Román-Medina and Fulana de Tal; El Bambú Pub; Yamill Jiménez-Torres, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Yamill Jiménez-Torres and Jane Doe; El Bodegón; Daniel Rivera, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Daniel Rivera and Fulana de Tal; Salón Billar Benny; Luis Rodríguez-Figueroa, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Rodríguez-Figueroa and Fulana de Tal; El Bambú Pop; Sandro Díaz, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Sandro Díaz and Fulana de Tal; La Barrita de Don Billy; Juan R. Ramos Ferrer, individually and the Conjugal Partnership of Juan R. Ramos Ferrer and Mary Doe. The Magistrate further recommended that Plaintiff be awarded attorneys' fees totaling \$13,400 and costs totaling \$1,890 (Docket # 54). To date, the parties have not filed any objections to the Magistrate's Report and the time allotted for doing so has expired. Therefore, the Court will **APPROVE** and **ADOPT** the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation as our own.

Standard of Review

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(B), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) and Local Rule 72(a) for the District of Puerto Rico, a District Court may refer motions to a United States Magistrate Judge for a Report and Recommendation. See Alamo Rodríguez v. Pfizer Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 286 F. Supp. 2d 144, 146 (D.P.R. 2003). The adversely affected party can "contest the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation by filing objections 'within ten days of being served' with a copy of the order."

Civil No. 04-1861(SEC)

2

United States of America v. Mercado-Pagán, 286 F. Supp. 2d 231, 233 (D.P.R. 2003) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Aside from being filed in a timely manner, objections “shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the legal basis for such objection.” Local Rule 72(d).

The scope of review of a Magistrate’s recommendation is set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c). This section provides that “[a] judge of the [district] court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations to which [an] objection is made.” Id. The Court can “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate,” however, if the affected party fails to timely file objections, “the district court can assume that they have agreed to the magistrate’s recommendation.” Alamo-Rodríguez, 286 F. Supp. 2d at 146 (quoting Templeman v. Chris Craft Corp., 770 F.2d 245, 247 (1st Cir. 1985)). Thus, no review is required of those issues to which objections are not timely raised. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985), reh’g denied, 474 U.S. 1111 (1986); Borden v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs., 836 F.2d 4, 6 (1st Cir. 1987). In fact, a party who fails to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation within ten days of its filing waives his or her right to appeal from the district court’s order. Henley Drilling Co. v. McGee, 36 F.3d 143, 150-51 (1st Cir. 1994); United States v. Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4, 5 (1st Cir. 1986); Davet v. Maccarone, 973 F.2d 22, 30-31 (1st Cir. 1992) (“[f]ailure to raise objections to the Report and Recommendation waives that party’s right to review in the district court and those claims not preserved by such objection are precluded on appeal”).

Analysis

The parties have not objected to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, thus we are not required by law to review it. However, upon review, we find no fault with the Magistrate Judge’s assessment and thus **APPROVE** and **ADOPT** her Report and Recommendation as our own. Accordingly, Partial Default Judgment will be entered as recommended.

SO ORDERED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 20th day of September, 2005.

S/ *Salvador E. Casellas*
SALVADOR E. CASELLAS
U.S. Senior District Judge